



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

ablative of instrument rather than of separation. Now it is undoubtedly the latter if our interpretation of *inligatum* be correct. Granting, then, that it is a question of loosing from the spell of Thessalian potions, we are not restricted in *deus* to one of the drug-using healing divinities. On the contrary, we may draw virtually on the entire pantheon, for the magician, being no respecter of gods save so far as his own immediate ends are served, is likely to call summarily on any god, of high or low degree, to cast or to dissolve a spell.<sup>1</sup> In the light of this explanation the four lines appear in style and structure as more worthy of the artist Horace. If *deus* points to a major divinity only, then the strength of the climax "*saga . . . magus . . . deus*" is nullified by the sudden fall to the level of Pegasus, who is, according to Horace's own conception, not a thoroughbred *deus* but only a hybrid offshoot;<sup>2</sup> in short, the ladder would be broken at the topmost round. But with our interpretation the climax would produce the illusion of being heightened by the introduction of the name of Pegasus, for this would follow *deus* on the same level, as a "for instance" illustration.<sup>3</sup> From the point of view of fact the climax remains as it is, but from the point of view of effect, which is the chief concern here, the climax is most imposingly extended.

May we not now offer the following rendering of the stanza in question: "What witch, what sorcerer, what divinity can free thee from Thessalian potions? Even Pegasus will be greatly tasked to free thee, bewitched (with potions) as thou art, from the three-bodied Chimaera"?

W. SHERWOOD FOX

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY  
November 22, 1912

#### ἌΝΤΙΣΤΡΟΦΗ ΣΥΝ ἈΝΤΙΘΕΣΕΙ

Prantl, in his *History of Logic* (I, 698), tells us that the technical expression *conversio per contrapositionem* occurs for the first time in Boethius. Martianus Capella describes it as *secunda conversio*, and Apuleius (*ibid.*, 585), though he has no technical term, explains that *omnis homo animal* is convertible as *omne non animal non homo*, which is also Boethius' example. Galen (*ibid.*, 569) uses the general term ἀντιστρέφον for the same form of conversion.

In all this Prantl and all the Greek lexicons known to me have overlooked the Greek technical term ἀντιστροφή σὺν ἀντιθέσει from which the

<sup>1</sup> Wunsch, *Defixionum Tabellae Atticae*, I, G, iii, 3, ind., p. 47; *Aud. op. cit.*, ind., pp. 460-70; Fox, "The Johns Hopkins Tabellae Defixionum," *Am. Jour. Philology*, XXX, 1, suppl., ind., p. 66.

<sup>2</sup> *deorum sanguinem* (*Odes* iv. 2. 13-14).

<sup>3</sup> To object that Pegasus appears in no extant charm or counter-charm is idle, for Horace is here in a fun-making mood, a mood that brings to shape in poets' minds many stranger conceptions than this.

Latin *conversio per contrapositionem* is plainly derived. It occurs in Olympiodorus on Plato's *Phaedo* 68B (Finckh, p. 88): ὅτι εἰ φιλόσοφος, ἀδεῖς πρὸς τὸν θάνατον εἰ δὲ μὴ ἀδεῖς, οὐ φιλόσοφος· σὺν ἀντιθέσει γὰρ ἀντιστρέφει. Before Olympiodorus the expression can be followed through the Aristotelian commentators as far back as Alexander; cf. Alexander in *Analyt. Prior.*, p. 29, 10 ff., p. 46, 6 ff., p. 327, 1; *idem* in *Top.*, pp. 191, 192; [Alexander] in *Sophist. Elench.*, p. 49, 5 ff., p. 178, 1 ff.; [Ammonius] in *Analyt. Prior.*, p. 68, 25 ff.; Philoponus in *Analyt. Prior.*, p. 42, 9 ff.; *idem* in *Analyt. Post.*, p. 174, 37; Anonym. Paraphrasis in *Sophist. Elench.*, p. 15, 23, 33; Elias in *Cat.* 179, 13. Alexander's own use of it as a technical term is quite clear and explicit. He writes, for example, in *Analyt. Prior.*, p. 46, 5 ff: ἐστὶ γὰρ προτάσεως ἀντιστροφή κοινωνία προτάσεων κατὰ τοὺς δύο ὁρους ἀνάπαλιν τιθεμένων μετὰ τοῦ συναληθεύειν. ὅταν μὲν οὖν κατὰ τὸ ποιοὺν διαφέρωσιν, αἱ τοιαῦται ἀντιστροφαὶ γίνονται τε καὶ λέγονται τῶν προτάσεων σὺν ἀντιθέσει. ὅταν δ' αἱ αὐταὶ κατὰ τὸ ποιοὺν ὦσιν, αἱ οὕτως λαμβανόμεναι καὶ συναληθεύουσαι ἀντιστροφαὶ χωρὶς ἀντιθέσεως γίνονται. I have not found it earlier than Alexander but have no doubt that it was in use.

Its origin and the force of ἀντίθεσις in this connection may, I think, be derived from certain passages of Aristotle. Aristotle was not unacquainted with this form of conversion, though Prantl seems to have overlooked it and Zeller explicitly says (II, 2, p. 225, n. 3): "Die Conversio per Contrapositionem kennt er noch nicht." It is clearly described in *Topics*, II, 8, 113, b 15; οἶον, εἰ ὁ ἄνθρωπος ζῶν, τὸ μὴ ζῶν οὐκ ἄνθρωπος, which it will be remembered is the very example of Apuleius and Galen *supra*.

Elsewhere he employs the word ἀντιθεσις in a way that may well have suggested the use we are considering. In *Metaphysics* 1055 b 32 ἐν ἀντιθέσει is used of the alternative λευκὸν ἢ οὐ λευκόν. More to the point is the description in *Analyt. Prior.*, p. 32, a 32, of the equivalence of ἐνδεχόμενον εἶναι and ἐνδεχόμενον μὴ εἶναι. Such propositions are said to be ὅσαι καταφατικὸν ἔχουσι τὸ σχῆμα κατὰ τὴν ἀντίθεσιν. In other words, as Alexander *ad loc.* explains at length, the propositions as a whole are both affirmative in spite of the negative μὴ accompanying εἶναι in one of them. That difference between εἶναι and μὴ εἶναι is indicated by the phrase κατὰ τὴν ἀντίθεσιν. Though affirmative as a whole they are internally antithetic in the opposition of εἶναι to μὴ εἶναι. It would only be a step further to speak of a conversion which required the addition of the negative as a conversion accompanied by antithesis, σὺν ἀντιθέσει. And this translated into Latin gives us the meaningless conversion by contraposition of the textbooks.

PAUL SHOREY

#### EMENDATION OF JULIAN ORATIO v 179C

τίς οὖν οὕτω παχὺς τὴν ψυχὴν, ὃς οὐ συνήσιν ὅτι δι' Ἑρμοῦ μὲν καὶ Ἀφροδίτης ἀνακαλεῖται πάντα πανταχοῦ τὰ τῆς γενέσεως ἔχοντα τὸ ἕνεκα τοῦ πάντη καὶ πάντως, ὃ τοῦ λόγου μάλιστα ἰδίῳ ἐστίν. For τὸ ἕνεκα τοῦ, etc., read τὸ ἕνεκα του (cf. Ar. *Met.* 1065 a 26 and *De part. an.* 639 b 14).